



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

(see Livy iv. 20) in order to honor a friend. Our author saves the emperor's reputation for veracity by suggesting that he may inadvertently have taken the archaic form *Coso=Cocco* as an old abbreviation for *Consul*. No 68 (1913) is an interesting essay on political conditions during the empire.

TENNEY FRANK

BRYN MAWR COLLEGE

Euripides Medea mit Scholien. Von ERNST DIEHL. Bonn: Marcus u. Weber, 1911. Pp. 116. M. 2.60.

Supplementum Euripideum. Von H. VON ARNIM. Bonn: Marcus u. Weber, 1913. Pp. 80. M. 2.

Supplementum Sophocleum. Edidit ERNESTUS DIEHL. Bonn: Marcus u. Weber, 1913. Pp. 33. M. 0.90.

These three volumes are Nos. 89, 112, and 113 in the series known as "Kleine Texte für Vorlesungen und Übungen." The publishers are to be congratulated for their enterprise in issuing so useful and inexpensive a collection. Every number has some distinctive feature and comprises material which could be assembled in the usual form only at much greater cost. Diehl's edition of the *Medea*, containing as it does a judicious selection of scholia and critical notes, is particularly valuable for use in a pro-seminar. I think, however, that an error of judgment was made in not mentioning the following conjectural readings: Earle's $\gamma\alpha\rho\gamma\hat{\eta}s$ at vs. 106, Musgrave's $\alpha\hat{\iota}\varphi$ at vs. 240, and Barnes's $\gamma\alpha\rho\tau\tau\tau$ at vs. 1296. The two *Supplementa* naturally are most serviceable to those who do not have access to the latest papyri publications, but provide a convenient résumé also for others. The one for Sophocles is mainly devoted to the *Ichneutae*, the text of which has been bettered at several points in the last two years and still demands many additional improvements. It is too bad that the fragments of the satyr-play in Oxyrhynchus Papyri VIII, which many scholars attribute to Sophocles, could not have been included in this volume. The *Supplementum Euripideum* begins with Satyrus' *Vita* and contains fragments from ten plays. As I have already stated on several occasions, it is desirable that all the fragments of Euripides, old as well as new, should be assembled into a fascicle by some competent editor.

R. C. F.

Morphologie historique du latin. (Nouvelle collection à l'usage des classes XXXII.) By A. ERNOUT. Paris: Klincksieck, 1914. Pp. xiii+367. Fr. 3.50.

The present handy little volume forms a continuation of Niedermann's *Phonétique historique du latin*, which appeared in 1906 in the same series. The necessity of referring to another volume for a statement of the phonetic

laws which have operated in the terminations discussed is of course a handicap; but against this we may set the advantage of having a whole volume at disposal for the discussion of the terminations alone. We have a right, therefore, to expect the discussion to be full and accurate, and free from carelessness of statement in the minutiae of the subject.

Precisely here is where the reviewer finds the book unsatisfactory. A few instances from the early part of the book will suffice. Page 6: a reference to *IF.*, XXX, 219, would give a clue to other supposed duals of the type *Cestio*; but there is no such reference, and we miss also a positive interpretation of the form, for it is unsatisfactory to find merely that "ces formes isolées ne suffisent pas à prouver l'existence en latin d'un duel à l'époque historique." What does Ernout himself think of them? Page 15, *infra*: that an *e*, situated like the second *e* in *generis*, might represent an earlier *u* is certainly not among the accepted theories of sound development in Latin. Page 17, *infra*: the *-ūs* of the genitive singular of the fourth declension is said to rest upon IE. *-ous*; but *-eus* is equally possible, and is distinctly favored by the *-eis* (not *-ois*) of the genitive of *i*-stems in Oscan. Pages 21-27: the discussion of the case endings is here partly from the Latin standpoint and partly from the Indo-European, and is therefore quite confusing. Pages 22 and 43: On the origin of the genitive singular in *-i*, the view of Ehrlich, *Untersuchungen über die Natur der griechischen Betonung*, pp. 67 ff., should at least be taken into consideration and a reference given; and so should that of Wackernagel, *Mélanges Saussure*, 125 ff. The claims of *-ai* as the ending of the dative singular in consonant stems (witness *δόμεναι*) seem stronger than those of *-ei*, despite *Διφεύ-φιλος* (cf. *KZ.*, XLIV, 161 ff.). Pages 25 and 29: that *-a* of the neuter plural is really based on IE. short *a* can hardly be maintained in the face of the Oscan and Umbrian forms and the tens from *tr̄igintā* to *nōnāgintā*. Pages 26 and 50: the original length of the diphthong in the dative-ablative plural of *ā*- and *o*-stems should be indicated. Pages 30-31: the explanation of the genitive *-āi* and *-ae* is quite unsatisfactory. For the late popular form in *-aes*, the Greek influence is certain; to suggest as an alternative the influence of an Oscan-Umbrian form in *-ās* is unnecessary and without plausibility, on grounds of chronology. Page 33, *infra*: the citation of a Sanskrit form or two would establish the genitive plural ending *-sōm* infinitely better than anything else. Page 34: the forms in *-ābus* are patently new forms, not survivals. Page 39: the production of nominative *-is*, accusative *-im*, in *io*-stems is not to be set earlier than the syncope in *ro*-stems. Page 40: through careless expression the preposterous development **agros* > **agrs* > **agrr* > **agr* > **agr* > *ager* is given; whereas the second form must at once change the *r* from consonant to vowel. Page 42: there is no evidence that the vocative of *ro*-stems is the phonetic descendant of the original vocative form rather than a nominative used as a vocative. Page 45: the presence of adverbs in *-ēd* suggests that this form was not originally an instrumental in *-ē*, but an ablative in *-ēd*,

and that the distinction between the adverb and the noun form in *-ōd* was a mere artificial distinction, like that between *ācer* and *ācris* in the nominative singular (cf. Ernout, p. 75). Page 46: here, as also at several other points, the results of Sturtevant, *Contraction in the Case Forms of the Latin *io* and *īā*-Stems, and of "deus," "is," and "idem,"* might profitably have been utilized. Page 47: on the value of Lucilius' rules for distinguishing between *i* and *ei* in writing, the fantastic view of Sommer seems less likely than either of two other views recently put forth in print; cf. *AJP.*, XXXIV, 315 ff., with bibliography. Page 51: the influence of *πλῆθος* and *venēnum* on the gender of *vulgaris* and *vīrus* seems at least a factor that might be mentioned.

But enough; page after page could be filled with such details, and what has been said should show satisfactorily that Ernout's book must be used with care and with reserve. Another disappointment is his failure to indicate his own view as to the solution of problems of particular difficulty, where he might surely give the alternative views which seem to him least unlikely, with reference to the important articles. A few examples from the latter portion of the book: why be so noncommittal about the passive infinitive in *-ier*, p. 244? about the origin of *sōns*, p. 245? about the origin of the gerundive, p. 247? about that of the perfect in *-ui*, p. 291 (cf. Sommer, *Handbuch d. lat. Laut.- u. Formenlehre*, 603 ff.)? about the third plural ending of the perfect in *-ēre*, p. 307?

Misprints are none too infrequent; and when we discover three misprints in the list of errata, tucked away at the end of the volume where we can hardly find it at all, *c'est à rire*.

Frankly speaking, the book is unsatisfactory. Its excuse for being should lie in newness of theories; or in accuracy and fulness of detail; or in being scrupulously up to date in the evaluation and utilization of periodical literature. Were it first class in all these points, it would be a welcome addition to our philological handbooks; but as it is, it will not serve to warn off others from the field, in the way in which Caesar's historical writings, through their surpassing qualities, deterred other historians of the first class from writing on the same events, according to what Cicero represents Brutus as saying (*Brut.* 75. 262).

ROLAND G. KENT

UNIVERSITY OF PENNSYLVANIA